

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 are pending in this application. Claims 4-11 have been cancelled.

Claims 1 and 3 are allowed.

The applicants' undersigned patent counsel expresses his appreciation to Examiner Niland for the helpful comments provided during the telephone interview of May 29, 2007. It is sincerely believed that the interview materially advanced prosecution of this application. The above noted revisions to the claims are believed to be commensurate with the discussions during the interview.

The substance of the interview primarily consisted of the applicant's questioning the status of the claims in view of the Office Action dated April 11, 2007, written by the prior Examiner (superseded by the present Office Action, issued by present Examiner Niland, dated June 5, 2007). In particular, the rejection of dependent claim 6 was questioned in view of the allowance of its base claim, and the question was raised about whether allowable claim 8 could be rewritten in independent form for allowance. Due to the apparent error in finding claim 8 to be allowable, the present Office Action was issued, dated June 5, 2007.

With respect to the present Office Action, the applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 7 and 11 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. However, claims 7 and 11 have been cancelled as shown above. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 2, 4, 7 and 11 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Please note that claims 4, 7 and 11 have been cancelled pursuant to the above.

The Examiner has found a lack of antecedent basis for the recitation of "liquid colorant precursor" in claim 2. Base claim 1 has been amended as shown above to provide antecedent basis for this recitation in claim 2. Accordingly, the applicants submit that all presently pending claims are fully allowable under Section 112, second paragraph.

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 4, 6, 7, 9 and 11 under 35 USC 102(b) in view of Sunamori et al. This reference does not anticipate the presently claimed invention or make it obvious. However, claims 4, 6, 7, 9 and 11 have been cancelled as shown above. Accordingly, the applicants ask that this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claim 1 and dependent claim 3 have been allowed in this application. The applicants assert that dependent claim 2 has been shown to be allowable as explained above. Thus, the applicants submit that claims 1-3 are allowable. Further, the applicants submit that in view of all other claims being cancelled, then this application, containing claims 1-3, should be allowed.

In view of the above , it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MANELLINI DENISON & SELTER, PLLC

By 
Paul E. White, Jr.
Reg. No. 32,011
Tel. No.: (202) 261-1050
Fax No.: (202) 887-0336

2000 M Street, N.W.
Seventh Floor
Washington, D.C. 20036-3307
(202) 261-1000